arXiv:1702.00383v1 [math.QA] 1 Feb 2017

THE CHAMBER ANSATZ FOR QUANTUM UNIPOTENT CELLS

HIRONORI OYA

Abstract. In this paper, we prove quantum analogues of the Chamber Ansatz formulae for unipotent cells. These formulae imply that the quantum twist automorphisms, constructed by Kimura and the author, are generalizations of Berenstein-Rupel's quantum twist automorphisms for unipotent cells associated with the squares of acyclic Coxeter elements. This conclusion implies that the known compatibility between quantum twist automorphisms and dual canonical bases corresponds to the property conjectured by Berenstein and Rupel.

1. Introduction

1.1. Totally positive elements of an arbitrary connected semisimple algebraic group G and some related varieties were introduced by Lusztig [17]. They are generalizations of totally positive matrices, which are defined as the square matrices such that all their minors are positive. The present paper concerns totally positive elements in *unipotent cells*. A unipotent cell N_-^w is a certain subvariey of a maximal unipotent subgroup N of G associated with an element w of the corresponding Weyl group. In [17], Lusztig has proved that totally positive elements in a unipotent cell are parametrized by the tuple of positive real numbers via a birational map from an algebraic torus to a unipotent cell. Berenstein, Fomin and Zelevinsky [2, 4] have given the reasonable criteria of total positivity in unipotent cells. Their research leads to their definition of *cluster algebras*. The key step for the proof of their criteria is an explicit description of the inverse of the birational map above, which is called *the Chamber Ansatz formulae*. The Chamber Ansatz formulae are given by *the generalized minors* and *twist automorphisms* on unipotent cells. In this paper, we consider the quantum analogues of all these situations.

1.2. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex finite dimensional semisimple Lie algebra. (From Section 2, we consider the case that $\mathfrak{g}$ is an arbitrary symmetrizable Kac-Moody Lie algebra.) Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}_- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_+$ be a triangular decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$, G the corresponding simply-connencted connected algebraic group, $N_\pm$, H the closed subgroups with Lie algebras $\mathfrak{n}_\pm$, $\mathfrak{h}$, respectively, $B_\pm := HN_\pm$ the Borel subgroups and $W := N_G(H)/H$ the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$. For $w \in W$, *a unipotent cell* is defined as the algebraic subvariety $N_-^w := N_- \cap B_+ \dot{w} B_+$ of N_-, where $\dot{w}$ is an arbitrary lift of w to $N_G(H)$. Let $\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$ (resp. $\{h_i \mid i \in I\}$) be the set of the simple roots (resp. coroots) of $\mathfrak{g}$, and $\{s_i \mid i \in I\}$ the set of simple reflections of W. Let f_i be a root vector corresponding to the root $-\alpha_i$, and $\mathbb{C} \to N_-, t \mapsto \exp(tf_i)$ the 1-parameter subgroup corresponding to f_i. Then for $w \in W$ and its reduced word $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell)$, there exists a map $y_{\boldsymbol{i}} \colon (\mathbb{C}^\times)^\ell \to N_-^w$ given by

$$(t_1, \dots, t_\ell) \mapsto \exp(t_1 f_{i_1}) \cdots \exp(t_\ell f_{i_\ell}).$$

The work of the author was supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows (No. 15J09231) and the Program for Leading Graduate Schools, MEXT, Japan.

Then it is known that $y_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ is injective and its image is a Zariski open subset of N_-^w. See, for example, [6, Proposition 2.18]. The problem on finding an explicit formulae for the inverse birational map $y_{\boldsymbol{i}}^{-1}$ is called *the factorization problem*. By the way, an element $n \in N_-^w$ is *totally positive* if and only if $n \in \operatorname{Im} y_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ and $y_{\boldsymbol{i}}^{-1}(n) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\ell}$ [17, Proposition 2.7]. This problem is also formulated as follows: the map $y_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ induces an embedding of algebras

$$y_{\boldsymbol{i}}^* \colon \mathbb{C}[N_-^w] \to \mathbb{C}[(\mathbb{C}^\times)^\ell] \simeq \mathbb{C}[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_\ell^{\pm 1}]. \tag{1.1}$$

The problem is to describe each t_k $(k = 1, \dots, \ell)$ as a rational function on N_-^w explicitly. As mentioned in subsection 1.1, a solution of this problem is the Chamber Ansatz formula. Let $\varpi_i \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\text{alg-grp}}(H, \mathbb{C}^\times)$ be a fundamental weight corresponding to $i \in I$. Set $G_0 := N_- H N_+$ and, for $g \in G_0$, write the corresponding decomposition as $g = [g]_-[g]_0[g]_+$. For $i \in I$, denote by $\Delta_{\varpi_i, \varpi_i}$ the regular function on G whose restriction to the open dense set G_0 is given by $\Delta_{\varpi_i, \varpi_i}(g) := \varpi_i([g]_0)$. Moreover, for $w_1, w_2 \in W$, define $\Delta_{w_1\varpi_i, w_2\varpi_i} \in \mathbb{C}[G]$ by $\Delta_{w_1\varpi_i, w_2\varpi_i}(g) = \Delta_{\varpi_i, \varpi_i}(\overline{w}_1^{-1} g \overline{w}_2)$, where $\overline{w}_1$, $\overline{w}_2$ are specific lifts of w_1, w_2 to $N_G(H)$, respectively. These elements are called *generalized minors*. Berenstein, Fomin and Zelevinsky introduced a biregular isomorphism $\eta_w \colon N_-^w \to N_-^w$ given by

$$n \mapsto [n^T \dot{w}]_-,$$

here n^T is a transpose of n in G. This is called *the twist automorphism on* N_-^w. Then the Chamber Ansatz formulae stand for the following description of t_k, $k = 1, \dots, \ell$ [2, Theorem 1.4], [4, Theorem 1.4]; set $y := y_{\boldsymbol{i}}(t_1, \dots, t_\ell)$ and $w_{\le m} := s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_m}$. Then,

$$t_k = \frac{\prod_{j \in I \setminus \{i_k\}} \Delta_{w_{\le k}\varpi_j, \varpi_j}(\eta_w^{-1}(y))^{-a_{j,i_k}}}{\Delta_{w_{\le k-1}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}(\eta_w^{-1}(y)) \Delta_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}(\eta_w^{-1}(y))},$$

here $a_{ij} := \langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle$.

1.3. A quantum analogues $\mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w]$ of the coordinate algebra $\mathbb{C}[N_-^w]$ is introduced in [5] and there are quantum analogues $[D_{w_1\varpi_i, w_2\varpi_i}] \in \mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w]$ of generalized minors on unipotent cells. There also exists a quantum analogue $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \colon \mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w] \to \mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ of $y_{\boldsymbol{i}}^*$, which is known as the Feigin homomorphism [1]. Here $\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ is a quantum torus in ℓ-variables $t_1, \dots, t_\ell$. Moreover a quantum analogue $\eta_{w,q} \colon \mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w] \to \mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w]$ of the (dual of) the twist automorphism $\eta_w^* \colon \mathbb{C}[N_-^w] \to \mathbb{C}[N_-^w]$ is defined by Kimura and the author in [14]. Note that we do not have "actual groups" but only have "coordinate rings" in the quantum settings. By using these materials, we obtain the Chamber Ansatz formula in the quantum settings.

Theorem (Theorem 3.5, Corollary 3.7)**.** *For $k = 1, \dots, \ell$, we have*

$$(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}]) (=: D'^{(\boldsymbol{i})}_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}) \simeq t_1^{-d_1} t_2^{-d_2} \cdots t_k^{-d_k},$$

where $d_j := \langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k} \rangle$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. Here $\simeq$ stands for the coincidence up to some powers of q. These formulae are equivalent to the following:

$$t_k \simeq (D'^{(\boldsymbol{i})}_{w_{\le k-1}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}})^{-1} (D'^{(\boldsymbol{i})}_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}})^{-1} \prod_{j \in I \setminus \{i_k\}} (D'^{(\boldsymbol{i})}_{w_{\le k}\varpi_j, \varpi_j})^{-a_{j,i_k}},$$

Note that the right-hand side is determined up to powers of q.

This is a generalization of Berenstein-Rupel's result [3, Corollary 1.2]. By this theorem, we can say that the quantum twist automorhism $\eta_{w,q}$ is a generalization of Berenstein-Rupel's quantum twist automorphism [3, Theorem 2.10], which has been constructed in the case that

w is the square of an acyclic Coxeter element, and corresponds to the one proposed in [3, Conjecture 2.12 (c)]. Moreover, its compatibility with the dual canonical basis which is proved in [14, Theorem 5.4] corresponds to Berenstein-Rupel's conjectural property [3, Conjecture 2.17 (a)].

The above theorem states the monomiality of $(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{q,w}^{-1})([D_{w \leq_k \varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}])$. This is a nontrivial point, and it would be interesting to understand this phenomenon via categorifications. Actually, in non-quantum settings, Geiß-Leclerc-Schröer have obtained an explanation by using their additive categorification [7, Theorem 1, Theorem 2].

1.4. The following are general notations in this paper.

(1) For a k-algebra $\mathscr{A}$, we set $[a_1, a_2] := a_1 a_2 - a_2 a_1$ for $a_1, a_2 \in \mathscr{A}$. *An Ore set $\mathscr{M}$ of $\mathscr{A}$* stands for a left and right Ore set consisting of regular elements. Denote by $\mathscr{A}[\mathscr{M}^{-1}]$ the algebra of fractions with respect to the Ore set $\mathscr{M}$. In this case, $\mathscr{A}$ is naturally a subalgebra of $\mathscr{A}[\mathscr{M}^{-1}]$. See [8, Chapter 6] for more details.
(2) *An $\mathscr{A}$-module V* means a left $\mathscr{A}$-module. The action of $\mathscr{A}$ on V is denoted by $a.u$ for $a \in \mathscr{A}$ and $u \in V$.
(3) For two letters i, j, the symbol δ_{ij} stands for the Kronecker delta.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Quantized enveloping algebras.

Definition 2.1. A root datum consists of the following data;

(1) I : a finite index set,
(2) $\mathfrak{h}$: a finite dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space,
(3) $P \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$: a lattice, called *the weight lattice*,
(4) $P^* = \{h \in \mathfrak{h} \mid \langle h, P \rangle \subset \mathbb{Z}\}$ with the canonical pairing $\langle\ ,\ \rangle : P^* \times P \to \mathbb{Z}$, called *the coweight lattice*,
(5) $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I} \subset P$: a subset, called the set of *simple roots*,
(6) $\{h_i\}_{i \in I} \subset P^*$: a subset, called the set of *simple coroots*,
(7) $(\ ,\ ) : P \times P \to \mathbb{Q}$: a $\mathbb{Q}$-valued symmetric $\mathbb{Z}$-bilinear form on P.

satisfying the following conditions:

(a) $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for $i \in I$,
(b) $\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle = 2\,(\alpha_i, \lambda) \,/\, (\alpha_i, \alpha_i)$ for $\lambda \in P$ and $i \in I$,
(c) $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I} := (\langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle)_{i,j \in I}$ is a symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix, that is $\langle h_i, \alpha_i \rangle = 2$, $\langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ for $i \neq j$ and, $\langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle = 0$ is equivalent to $\langle h_j, \alpha_i \rangle = 0$,
(d) $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$, $\{h_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ are linearly independent subsets.

The $\mathbb{Z}$-submodule $Q = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i \subset P$ is called *the root lattice*. We set $Q_+ = \sum \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_i \subset Q$ and $Q_- = -Q_+$. Let $P_+ := \{\lambda \in P \mid \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \text{ for all } i \in I\}$ and we assume that there exists $\{\varpi_i\}_{i \in I} \subset P_+$ such that $\langle h_i, \varpi_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$. An element of P_+ is called *a dominant integral weight*.

Definition 2.2. Let W be *the Weyl group* associated with the above root datum, that is, the group generated by $\{s_i\}_{i \in I}$ with the defining relations $s_i^2 = e$ for $i \in I$ and $(s_i s_j)^{m_{ij}} = e$ for $i, j \in I$, $i \neq j$. Here e is the unit of W, $m_{ij} = 2$ (resp. $3, 4, 6, \infty$) if $a_{ij} a_{ji} = 0$ (resp. $1, 2, 3, \geq 4$), and $w^\infty := e$ for any $w \in W$. We have the group homomorphisms $W \to \operatorname{Aut} \mathfrak{h}$ and

$W \to \operatorname{Aut}\mathfrak{h}^*$ given by

$$s_i(h) = h - \langle h, \alpha_i\rangle h_i \qquad\qquad s_i(\mu) = \mu - \langle h_i, \mu\rangle \alpha_i$$

for $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. For an element w of W, $\ell(w)$ denotes the length of w, that is, the smallest integer ℓ such that there exist $i_1, \dots, i_\ell \in I$ with $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$. For $w \in W$, set

$$I(w) := \{\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{\ell(w)}) \in I^{\ell(w)} \mid w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{\ell(w)}}\}.$$

An element of $I(w)$ is called *a reduced word of* w. When fixing a reduced word $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$, we write $w_{\le k} := s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k}$ and $w_{k\le} := s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$ for $1 \le k \le \ell$. Moreover set $w_{\le 0} := e$.

Notation 2.3. Let q be an indeterminate. Set

$$\begin{aligned}
&q_i := q^{\frac{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)}{2}},\ [n] := \frac{q^n - q^{-n}}{q - q^{-1}} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{Z},\\
&\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} := \begin{cases} \dfrac{[n][n-1]\cdots[n-k+1]}{[k][k-1]\cdots[1]} & \text{if } n \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0},\\ 1 & \text{if } n \in \mathbb{Z}, k = 0, \end{cases}\\
&[n]! := [n][n-1]\cdots[1] \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, [0]! := 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $[n], \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$ and $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} = \dfrac{[n]!}{[k]![n-k]!}$ if $n \ge k \ge 0$. For a rational function $R \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$, we define R_i as the rational function obtained from X by substituting q by q_i.

Definition 2.4. *The quantized enveloping algebra* $\mathbf{U}_q$ is the unital associative $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra (associated with $(P, I, \{\alpha_i\}_{i\in I}, \{h_i\}_{i\in I}, (\ ,\ ))$) defined by the generators

$$e_i, f_i\ (i \in I), q^h\ (h \in P^*),$$

and the relations (i)–(iv) below:

(i) $q^0 = 1,\ q^h q^{h'} = q^{h+h'}$ for $h, h' \in P^*$,

(ii) $q^h e_i = q^{\langle h,\alpha_i\rangle} e_i q^h,\ q^h f_i = q^{-\langle h,\alpha_i\rangle} f_i q^h$ for $h \in P^*, i \in I$,

(iii) $[e_i, f_j] = \delta_{ij} \dfrac{t_i - t_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$ for $i, j \in I$ where $t_i := q^{\frac{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)}{2} h_i}$,

(iv) $\displaystyle\sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k \begin{bmatrix} 1-a_{ij} \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i x_i^k x_j x_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} = 0$ for $i, j \in I$ with $i \ne j$, and $x = e, f$.

The $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-subalgebra of $\mathbf{U}_q$ generated by $\{f_i\}_{i\in I}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{U}_q^-$. For $\alpha \in Q$, write $(\mathbf{U}_q)_\alpha := \{x \in \mathbf{U}_q \mid q^h x q^{-h} = q^{\langle \alpha, h\rangle} x \text{ for all } h \in P^*\}$. The elements of $(\mathbf{U}_q)_\alpha$ are said to be *homogeneous*. For a homogeneous element $x \in (\mathbf{U}_q)_\alpha$, we set $\operatorname{wt} x = \alpha$. For any subset $X \subset \mathbf{U}_q$ and $\alpha \in Q$, we set $X_\alpha := X \cap (\mathbf{U}_q)_\alpha$.

Definition 2.5. Let $\vee\colon \mathbf{U}_q \to \mathbf{U}_q$ be the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra involution defined by

$$e_i^\vee = f_i, \qquad\qquad f_i^\vee = e_i, \qquad\qquad (q^h)^\vee = q^{-h}.$$

Let $\overline{\ }\colon \mathbb{Q}(q) \to \mathbb{Q}(q)$, $\overline{\ }\colon \mathbf{U}_q \to \mathbf{U}_q$ be the $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra involutions defined by

$$\overline{q} = q^{-1}, \qquad\qquad \overline{e_i} = e_i, \qquad\qquad \overline{f_i} = f_i, \qquad\qquad \overline{q^h} = q^{-h}.$$

Let $*, \varphi\colon \mathbf{U}_q \to \mathbf{U}_q$ be the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-anti-algebra involutions defined by

$$\begin{aligned} *(e_i) &= e_i, & *(f_i) &= f_i, & *(q^h) &= q^{-h}, \\ \varphi(e_i) &= f_i, & \varphi(f_i) &= e_i, & \varphi(q^h) &= q^h. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\varphi = \vee \circ * = * \circ \vee$.

Definition 2.6. Define the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-bilinear form $(\ ,\ )_L\colon \mathbf{U}_q^- \times \mathbf{U}_q^- \to \mathbb{Q}(q)$ as follows. See, for example, [18, Chapter 1] for more details: for $i \in I$, there uniquely exist the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-linear maps e_i', ${}_ie'\colon \mathbf{U}_q^- \to \mathbf{U}_q^-$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} e_i'(xy) &= e_i'(x)\,y + q_i^{\langle \mathrm{wt}\, x, h_i\rangle} x e_i'(y), & e_i'(f_j) &= \delta_{ij}, \\ {}_ie'(xy) &= q_i^{\langle \mathrm{wt}\, y, h_i\rangle}\, {}_ie'(x)\,y + x\, {}_ie'(y), & {}_ie'(f_j) &= \delta_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

for homogeneous elements $x, y \in \mathbf{U}_q^-$. Then there uniquely exists the symmetric $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-bilinear form satisfying

$$(1,1)_L = 1, \qquad (f_i x, y)_L = \frac{1}{1-q_i^2}(x, e_i'(y))_L, \qquad (xf_i, y)_L = \frac{1}{1-q_i^2}(x, {}_ie'(y))_L$$

for $x, y \in \mathbf{U}_q^-$. In fact, $(\ ,\ )_L$ is nondegenerate and it has the following property:

$$(*(x), *(y))_L = (x, y)_L$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbf{U}_q^-$.

2.2. **Lusztig's braid group symmetries.** We present the definition of braid group actions on integrable modules and quantized enveloping algebras, and review the fundamental properties of them. All statements in this subsections are found, for example, in [18], [19].

Definition 2.7. Let V be a $\mathbf{U}_q$-module. For $\mu \in P$, we set

$$V_\mu := \{u \in V \mid q^h.u = q^{\langle h,\mu\rangle}u \ \text{ for all } h \in P^*\}.$$

This is called *the weight space of V of weight μ*, and for $u \in V_\mu$, we write $\mathrm{wt}\, u := \mu$. A $\mathbf{U}_q$-module $V = \bigoplus_{\mu\in P} V_\mu$ with weight space decomposition is said to be *integrable* if e_i and f_i act locally nilpotently on V for all $i \in I$.

Definition 2.8. For $\lambda \in P_+$, denote by $V(\lambda)$ the integrable highest weight $\mathbf{U}_q$-module generated by a highest weight vector u_λ of weight λ. Note that $V(\lambda)$ is irreducible. There exists a unique $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-bilinear form $(\ ,\ )_\lambda^\varphi\colon V(\lambda)\times V(\lambda) \to \mathbb{Q}(q)$ such that

$$(u_\lambda, u_\lambda)_\lambda^\varphi = 1 \qquad\qquad (x.u_1, u_2)_\lambda^\varphi = (u_1, \varphi(x).u_2)_\lambda^\varphi$$

for $u_1, u_2 \in V(\lambda)$ and $x \in \mathbf{U}_q$. Moreover the form $(\ ,\ )_\lambda^\varphi$ is nondegenerate and symmetric. There exists the $\mathbb{Q}$-linear automorphism $\overline{\ }\colon V(\lambda) \to V(\lambda)$ given by $\overline{x.u_\lambda} = \overline{x}.u_\lambda$ for $x \in \mathbf{U}_q$.

For $w \in W$, define the element $u_{w\lambda} \in V(\lambda)$ by

$$u_{w\lambda} = f_{i_1}^{(\langle h_{i_1}, s_{i_2}\cdots s_{i_\ell}\lambda\rangle)} \cdots f_{i_{\ell-1}}^{(\langle h_{i_{\ell-1}}, s_{i_\ell}\lambda\rangle)} f_{i_\ell}^{(\langle h_{i_\ell}, \lambda\rangle)}.u_\lambda$$

for $(i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$. It is known that this element does not depend on the choice of $(i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$ and $w \in W$. See, for example, [18, Proposition 39.3.7]. Then $(u_{w\lambda}, u_{w\lambda})_\lambda^\varphi = 1$ and $\overline{u_{w\lambda}} = u_{w\lambda}$.

Definition 2.9. Let $V = \bigoplus_{\mu\in P} V_\mu$ be an integrable $\mathbf{U}_q$-module. We can define a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-linear automorphism $T_i\colon V \to V$ for $i \in I$ by

$$T_i(u) := \sum_{-a+b-c=\langle h_i,\mu\rangle} (-1)^b q_i^{-ac+b} e_i^{(a)} f_i^{(b)} e_i^{(c)}.u$$

for $u \in V_\mu$ and $\mu \in P$.

Definition 2.10. We can define a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra automorphism $T_i\colon \mathbf{U}_q \to \mathbf{U}_q$ for $i \in I$ by the following formulae:

$$T_i(q^h) = q^{s_i(h)},$$

$$T_i(e_j) = \begin{cases} -f_i t_i & \text{for } j = i, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{r+s=-\langle h_i,\alpha_j\rangle} (-1)^r q_i^{-r} e_i^{(s)} e_j e_i^{(r)} & \text{for } j \neq i, \end{cases}$$

$$T_i(f_j) = \begin{cases} -t_i^{-1} e_i & \text{for } j = i, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{r+s=-\langle h_i,\alpha_j\rangle} (-1)^r q_i^{r} f_i^{(r)} f_j f_i^{(s)} & \text{for } j \neq i. \end{cases}$$

The following are fundamental properties of T_i.

Proposition 2.11. *Let V be an integrable $\mathbf{U}_q$-module.*

1. *For $i \in I$, $T_i(x.u) = T_i(x).T_i(u)$ for $u \in V$ and $x \in \mathbf{U}_q$.*
2. *For $w \in W$, the composition maps $T_w := T_{i_1} \cdots T_{i_\ell}\colon V \to V$, $\mathbf{U}_q \to \mathbf{U}_q$ do not depend on the choice of $(i_1, \ldots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$.*
3. *For $\mu \in P$ and $w \in W$, T_w maps V_μ to $V_{w\mu}$.*

Proposition 2.12. *Let V be an integrable $\mathbf{U}_q$-module and $i \in I$. Then, for $u \in V_\mu \cap \mathrm{Ker}(e_i.)$ and $u' \in V_{\mu'} \cap \mathrm{Ker}(f_i.)$, we have*

$$T_i^{-1}(u) = f_i^{(\langle h_i,\mu\rangle)}.u \qquad\qquad T_i(u') = e_i^{(-\langle h_i,\mu'\rangle)}.u'.$$

In particular, for $\lambda \in P_+$ and $w \in W$, we have

$$u_{w\lambda} = (T_{w^{-1}})^{-1}(u_\lambda).$$

Proposition 2.13. (1) *For $i \in I$, we have $\mathrm{Ker}\, e_i' = \mathbf{U}_q^- \cap T_i \mathbf{U}_q^-$ and $\mathrm{Ker}\, {}_ie' = \mathbf{U}_q^- \cap T_i^{-1} \mathbf{U}_q^-$.*
(2) *For $i \in I$ and $x, y \in \mathrm{Ker}\, e_i'$, we have $(x, y)_L = \left(T_i^{-1}(x), T_i^{-1}(y)\right)_L$.*

2.3. **Canonical/Dual canonical bases.** Canonical bases(=lower global bases) are defined by Lusztig [15, 16, 18] and Kashiwara [9] independently. In this subsection, we briefly review the definitions of canonical bases of $\mathbf{U}_q^-$ and $V(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in P_+$, following Kashiwara [9]. Let $\mathcal{A}_0$ be the subalgebra of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ consisting of rational functions without poles at $q = 0$. Set $\mathcal{A} := \mathbb{Q}[q^{\pm 1}]$.

Definition 2.14. For $i \in I$, we have $\mathbf{U}_q^- = \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} f_i^{(k)} \mathrm{Ker}\, e_i'$ [9, 3.5]. Hence we can define the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-linear maps $\tilde{e}_i$, $\tilde{f}_i\colon \mathbf{U}_q^- \to \mathbf{U}_q^-$ by

$$\tilde{e}_i(f_i^{(k)} u) = f_i^{(k-1)} u \qquad\qquad \tilde{f}_i(f_i^{(k)} u) = f_i^{(k+1)} u$$

for $u \in \operatorname{Ker} e_i'$ where $f_i^{(-1)}u := 0$. We have $\tilde{e}_i \circ \tilde{f}_i = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{U}_q^-}$. Set

$$\mathscr{L}(\infty) := \sum_{\ell \geq 0, i_1, \dots, i_\ell \in I} \mathcal{A}_0 \tilde{f}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_\ell} 1 \subset \mathbf{U}_q^-,$$
$$\mathscr{B}(\infty) := \{\tilde{f}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_\ell} 1 \bmod q\mathscr{L}(\infty) \mid \ell \geq 0, i_1, \dots, i_\ell \in I\} \subset \mathscr{L}(\infty)/q\mathscr{L}(\infty).$$

Henceforth write $\tilde{b}_\infty := 1 \bmod q\mathscr{L}(\infty)$. The pair $(\mathscr{L}(\infty), \mathscr{B}(\infty))$ satisfies the following properties [9, Theorem 4]:

(i) $\mathscr{L}(\infty)$ is a free $\mathcal{A}_0$-module and $\mathbb{Q}(q) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}_0} \mathscr{L}(\infty) \simeq \mathbf{U}_q^-$,
(ii) $\mathscr{B}(\infty)$ is a basis of the $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space $\mathscr{L}(\infty)/q\mathscr{L}(\infty)$,
(iii) $\tilde{e}_i\mathscr{L}(\infty) \subset \mathscr{L}(\infty)$ and $\tilde{f}_i\mathscr{L}(\infty) \subset \mathscr{L}(\infty)$ for all $i \in I$,
(iv) $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ induce $\tilde{e}_i \colon \mathscr{B}(\infty) \to \mathscr{B}(\infty) \coprod \{0\}$ and $\tilde{f}_i \colon \mathscr{B}(\infty) \to \mathscr{B}(\infty)$, respectively, for all $i \in I$,
(v) For $\tilde{b} \in \mathscr{B}(\infty)$ with $\tilde{e}_i\tilde{b} \in \mathscr{B}(\infty)$, we have $\tilde{b} = \tilde{f}_i\tilde{e}_i\tilde{b}$.

This pair $(\mathscr{L}(\infty), \mathscr{B}(\infty))$ is called *the (lower) crystal basis of* $\mathbf{U}_q^-$. For $i \in I$, define the maps $\varepsilon_i, \varphi_i \colon \mathscr{B}(\infty) \to \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\varepsilon_i(\tilde{b}) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \tilde{e}_i^k\tilde{b} \neq 0\} \qquad \varphi_i(\tilde{b}) = \varepsilon_i(\tilde{b}) + \langle h_i, \operatorname{wt} \tilde{b} \rangle,$$

for $\tilde{b} \in \mathscr{B}(\infty)$. Then the sextuple $(\mathscr{B}(\infty); \operatorname{wt}, \{\tilde{e}_i\}_{i\in I}, \{\tilde{f}_i\}_{i\in I}, \{\varepsilon_i\}_{i\in I}, \{\varphi_i\}_{i\in I})$ is a crystal in the sense of [10].

Moreover we have $*(\mathscr{L}(\infty)) = \mathscr{L}(\infty)$ and $*(\mathscr{B}(\infty)) = \mathscr{B}(\infty)$ [9, Proposition 5.2.4], [10, Theorem 2.1.1]. Hence we can define a new crystal $(\mathscr{B}(\infty); \operatorname{wt}, \{\tilde{e}_i^*\}_{i\in I}, \{\tilde{f}_i^*\}_{i\in I}, \{\varepsilon_i^*\}_{i\in I}, \{\varphi_i^*\}_{i\in I})$ by

$$\varepsilon_i^* := \varepsilon_i \circ *, \varphi_i^* := \varphi_i \circ *, \tilde{e}_i^* := * \circ \tilde{e}_i \circ *, \tilde{f}_i^* := * \circ \tilde{f}_i \circ *.$$

Note that $\varepsilon_i^*(\tilde{b}) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid (\tilde{e}_i^*)^k\tilde{b} \neq 0\}$.

Let $\mathbf{U}_\mathcal{A}^-$ be the $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra of $\mathbf{U}_q^-$ generated by $\{f_i^{(k)}\}_{i\in I, k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$. Then the canonical map

$$\mathscr{L}(\infty) \cap \overline{\mathscr{L}(\infty)} \cap \mathbf{U}_\mathcal{A}^- \to \mathscr{L}(\infty)/q\mathscr{L}(\infty)$$

is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}$-vector spaces [9, Theorem 6]. The inverse of this map is denoted by G^{low}. The set $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{low}} := \{G^{\mathrm{low}}(\tilde{b})\}_{\tilde{b}\in\mathscr{B}(\infty)}$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-basis of $\mathbf{U}_\mathcal{A}^-$ and this is called *the canonical basis* of $\mathbf{U}_q^-$. We have $*(G^{\mathrm{low}}(\tilde{b})) = G^{\mathrm{low}}(*\tilde{b})$ for $\tilde{b} \in \mathscr{B}(\infty)$.

Definition 2.15. Let $\lambda \in P_+$. For $i \in I$, we define the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-linear maps $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i \colon V(\lambda) \to V(\lambda)$ by

$$\tilde{e}_i(f_i^{(k)}.u) = f_i^{(k-1)}.u \qquad \tilde{f}_i(f_i^{(k)}.u) = f_i^{(k+1)}.u$$

for $u \in \operatorname{Ker}(e_i.) \cap V(\lambda)$, where $f_i^{(-1)}.u := 0$. Set

$$\mathscr{L}(\lambda) := \sum_{\ell \geq 0, i_1, \dots, i_\ell \in I} \mathcal{A}_0 \tilde{f}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_\ell} u_\lambda \subset V(\lambda),$$
$$\mathscr{B}(\lambda) := \{\tilde{f}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_\ell} u_\lambda \bmod q\mathscr{L}(\lambda) \mid \ell \geq 0, i_1, \dots, i_\ell \in I\} \setminus \{0\} \subset \mathscr{L}(\lambda)/q\mathscr{L}(\lambda).$$

Henceforth write $b_\lambda := u_\lambda \bmod q\mathscr{L}(\lambda) \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda)$. Then the pair $(\mathscr{L}(\lambda), \mathscr{B}(\lambda))$ satisfies the following properties [9, Theorem 2]:

(i) $\mathscr{L}(\lambda)$ is a free $\mathcal{A}_0$-module and $\mathbb{Q}(q) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}_0} \mathscr{L}(\lambda) \simeq V(\lambda)$,
(ii) $\mathscr{B}(\lambda)$ is a basis of the $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space $\mathscr{L}(\lambda)/q\mathscr{L}(\lambda)$,

(iii) $\tilde{e}_i\mathscr{L}(\lambda) \subset \mathscr{L}(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{f}_i\mathscr{L}(\lambda) \subset \mathscr{L}(\lambda)$ for all $i \in I$,
(iv) $\tilde{e}_i$ and $\tilde{f}_i$ induce $\tilde{e}_i\colon \mathscr{B}(\lambda) \to \mathscr{B}(\lambda)\coprod\{0\}$ and $\tilde{f}_i\colon \mathscr{B}(\lambda) \to \mathscr{B}(\lambda)\coprod\{0\}$, respectively, for all $i \in I$,
(v) For $b, b' \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda)$, we have $b' = \tilde{f}_i b$ if and only if $b = \tilde{e}_i b'$.

This pair $(\mathscr{L}(\lambda), \mathscr{B}(\lambda))$ is called *the (lower) crystal basis of* $V(\lambda)$. For $i \in I$, define the maps ε_i, $\varphi_i\colon \mathscr{B}(\lambda) \to \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\varepsilon_i(b) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \tilde{e}_i^k b \neq 0\} \qquad \varphi_i(b) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \tilde{f}_i^k b \neq 0\} = \varepsilon_i(b) + \langle h_i, \operatorname{wt} b\rangle,$$

for $b \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda)$. Then the sextuple $(\mathscr{B}(\lambda); \operatorname{wt}, \{\tilde{e}_i\}_{i\in I}, \{\tilde{f}_i\}_{i\in I}, \{\varepsilon_i\}_{i\in I}, \{\varphi_i\}_{i\in I})$ is a crystal.

Set $V_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda) := \mathbf{U}^-_{\mathcal{A}}.u_\lambda$. Then the canonical map

$$\mathscr{L}(\lambda) \cap \overline{\mathscr{L}(\lambda)} \cap V_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda) \to \mathscr{L}(\lambda)/q\mathscr{L}(\lambda)$$

is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}$-vector spaces [9, Theorem 6]. The inverse of this map is denoted by G^{low}_λ. The set $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{low}}(\lambda) := \{G^{\mathrm{low}}_\lambda(b)\}_{b\in\mathscr{B}(\lambda)}$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-basis of $V_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda)$ and this is called *the canonical basis of* $V(\lambda)$. For $b \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda)$, write

$$\tilde{e}_i^{\max} b := \tilde{e}_i^{\varepsilon_i(b)} b \qquad\qquad \tilde{f}_i^{\max} b := \tilde{f}_i^{\varphi_i(b)} b.$$

Definition 2.16. Denote by $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{up}}$ (resp. $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{up}}(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in P_+$) the basis of $\mathbf{U}^-_q$ (resp. $V(\lambda)$) dual to $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{low}}$ (resp. $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{low}}(\lambda)$) with respect to the bilinear form $(\ ,\ )_L$ (resp. $(\ ,\ )^\varphi_\lambda$), that is, $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{up}} = \{G^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde{b})\}_{\tilde{b}\in\mathscr{B}(\infty)}$ (resp. $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{up}}(\lambda) = \{G^{\mathrm{up}}(b)\}_{b\in\mathscr{B}(\lambda)}$) such that

$$(G(\tilde{b}), G^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde{b}'))_L = \delta_{\tilde{b},\tilde{b}'} \qquad\qquad (\text{resp. } (G^{\mathrm{low}}_\lambda(b), G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b'))^\varphi_\lambda = \delta_{b,b'})$$

for any $\tilde{b}, \tilde{b}' \in \mathscr{B}(\infty)$ (resp. $b, b' \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda)$).

Example 2.17. For $\lambda \in P_+$ and $w \in W$, the vector $u_{w\lambda}$ belongs to $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{low}}(\lambda)$ and $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{up}}(\lambda)$.

Proposition 2.18 ([12, Lemma 5.1.1])**.** *For $i \in I$, $\lambda \in P_+$ and $b \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda)$, we have*

$$e_i^{(\varepsilon_i(b))}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b) = G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(\tilde{e}_i^{\max} b) \qquad e_i^{(k)}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b) = 0 \text{ if } k > \varepsilon_i(b),$$
$$f_i^{(\varphi_i(b))}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b) = G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(\tilde{f}_i^{\max} b) \qquad f_i^{(k)}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b) = 0 \text{ if } k > \varphi_i(b).$$

2.4. **Unipotent quantum matrix coefficients.** We present the definition and the properties of quantum analogues of matrix coefficients on unipotent groups. The dual canonical basis elements of $\mathbf{U}^-_q$ are described as the quantum matrix coefficients associated with dual canonical basis elements of integrable highest weight modules.

Definition 2.19. For $\lambda \in P_+$ and $u, u' \in V(\lambda)$, define the element $D_{u,u'} \in \mathbf{U}^-_q$ by the following property:

$$(D_{u,u'}, x)_L = (u, x.u')^\varphi_\lambda$$

for all $x \in \mathbf{U}^-_q$. Note that the element $D_{u,u'}$ is uniquely determined by the nondegeneracy of the pairing $(\ ,\ )_L$. We call an element of this form *a unipotent quantum matrix coefficient*. Note that $\operatorname{wt}\left(D_{u,u'}\right) = \operatorname{wt} u - \operatorname{wt} u'$ for weight vectors $u, u' \in V(\lambda)$. For $w, w' \in W$, write

$$D_{w\lambda,w'\lambda} := D_{u_{w\lambda},u_{w'\lambda}}.$$

An element of this form is called *a unipotent quantum minor*.

The following property is nothing but the well-known "compatibility" between the canonical basis of $\mathbf{U}_q^-$ and that of $V(\lambda)$. The assertion (1) follows from [9, Theorem 5], and the assertion (2) follows from [18, Proposition 25.2.6] and [11, 8.2.2 (iii), (iv)]. See also [14, Proposition 2.67].

Proposition 2.20. *Let $w \in W$, $\lambda \in P_+$ and $b \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda)$. Then we have the following:*

(1) *the element $D_{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b),u_\lambda}$ belongs to $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{up}}$,*
(2) *the element $D_{u_{w\lambda},G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)}$ belongs to $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{up}}$ or equals 0.*

In particular, nonzero unipotent quantum minors are elements of $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{up}}$.

Remark 2.21. In [14], we write $D_{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b),u_\lambda} = G^{\mathrm{up}}\left(\overline{\jmath}_\lambda(b)\right)$ and $D_{u_{w\lambda},G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)} = G^{\mathrm{up}}\left(*\overline{\jmath}^\vee_{w\lambda}(b)\right)$ for $b \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda)$ by using the maps $\overline{\jmath}_\lambda \colon \mathscr{B}(\lambda) \to \mathscr{B}(\infty)$ and $\overline{\jmath}^\vee_{w\lambda} \colon \mathscr{B}(\lambda) \to \mathscr{B}(\infty) \coprod \{0\}$. See also Remark 2.24 below.

The following slightly technical proposition is used when we consider the inverse of a quantum twist automorphism below (see (2.2)). Recall the notation in Definition 2.2.

Proposition 2.22 ([13, Corollary 6.4], [14, Theorem 2.69])**.** *Let $\lambda \in P_+$, $w \in W$ and fix $\boldsymbol{i} \in I(w)$. Then, for $0 \leq k \leq \ell(w)$, there exist $\lambda' \in P_+$ and $b \in \mathscr{B}(\lambda')$ such that $D_{u_{w\lambda'},G_{\lambda'}^{\mathrm{up}}(b)} = D_{w_{\leq k}\lambda,\lambda}$.*

2.5. **Quantum unipotent cells and quantum twist automorphisms.** A quantum unipotent cell is a quantum analogue of the coordinate algebra of a unipotent cell. The quantum unipotent cells are essentially introduced by De Concini-Procesi [5]. We also define quantum twist automorphisms, which are introduced by Kimura and the author [14], on quantum unipotent cells. They are the dramatis personae of the Chamber Ansatz formulae.

Proposition 2.23 ([10, Proposition 3.2.3, 3.2.5])**.** *For $\lambda \in P_+$, $w \in W$ and $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \cdots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$, we set*

$$\mathscr{B}_w(\lambda) := \left\{ \widetilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \widetilde{f}_{i_\ell}^{a_\ell} b_\lambda \mid \boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\ell \right\} \setminus \{0\} \subset \mathscr{B}(\lambda).$$

Then we have

$$V_w(\lambda) := \mathbf{U}_q^+ . u_{w\lambda} = \sum_{b \in \mathscr{B}_w(\lambda)} \mathbb{Q}(q)\, G_\lambda^{\mathrm{low}}(b).$$

This $\mathbf{U}_q^{\geq 0}$-module $V_w(\lambda)$ is called a Demazure module*.*

(2) *For $w \in W$ and $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \cdots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$, we set*

$$\mathscr{B}_w(\infty) = \left\{ \widetilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \widetilde{f}_{i_\ell}^{a_\ell} \tilde{b}_\infty \mid \boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\ell \right\}$$

and $\mathbf{U}_w^- := \sum_{a_1,\ldots,a_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathbb{Q}(q)\, f_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots f_{i_\ell}^{a_\ell}$. Then we have

$$\mathbf{U}_w^- = \sum_{\tilde{b} \in \mathscr{B}_w(\infty)} \mathbb{Q}(q)\, G^{\mathrm{low}}(\tilde{b}).$$

For more details on Demazure modules and their crystal bases, see Kashiwara [10].

Remark 2.24. Recall Proposition 2.20. If $b \in \mathscr{B}_w(\lambda)$, then $D_{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b),u_\lambda} = G^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde{b})$ for some $\tilde{b} \in \mathscr{B}_w(\infty)$. The element $D_{u_{w\lambda},G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)}$ is equal to 0 if and only if $b \notin \mathscr{B}_w(\lambda)$.

Definition 2.25. Let $w \in W$. Set

$$\left(\mathbf{U}_w^-\right)^\perp := \{x \in \mathbf{U}_q^- \mid (x, \mathbf{U}_w^-)_L = 0\}.$$

Then, by the property of the pairing $(\ ,\ )_L$, $(\mathbf{U}_w^-)^\perp$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathbf{U}_q^-$. Hence we obtain a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra $\mathbf{U}_q^- / (\mathbf{U}_w^-)^\perp$, which is denoted by $\mathbf{A}_q[N_- \cap X_w]$ and called *the quantum closed unipotent cell*. See [14] for the meaning of the notation.

The quantum closed unipotent cell has a Q_--graded algebra structure induced from that of $\mathbf{U}_q^-$. Describe the canonical projection $\mathbf{U}_q^- \to \mathbf{A}_q[N_- \cap X_w]$ as $x \mapsto [x]$. The element $[x]$ clearly depends on w, however, we omit to write w because it will cause no confusion below. By Proposition 2.23, we have

$$\left(\mathbf{U}_w^-\right)^\perp = \sum_{\tilde{b} \in \mathscr{B}(\infty) \setminus \mathscr{B}_w(\infty)} \mathbb{Q}\,(q)\, G^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde{b}).$$

Hence $\mathbf{A}_q[N_- \cap X_w]$ has the dual canonical basis $\{[G^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde{b})] \mid \tilde{b} \in \mathscr{B}_w(\infty)\}$.

Proposition 2.26 ([13, Proposition 6.11])**.** *Let $w \in W$ and set $\mathcal{D}_w := \{q^m D_{w\lambda,\lambda} \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, \lambda \in P_+\}$. Then the set $[\mathcal{D}_w]$ is an Ore set of $\mathbf{A}_q[N_- \cap X_w]$ consisting of q-central elements. More explicitly, for $\lambda, \lambda' \in P_+$ and a homogeneous element $[x] \in \mathbf{A}_q[N_- \cap X_w]$, we have*

1. $q^{-(\lambda, w\lambda' - \lambda')} D_{w\lambda,\lambda} D_{w\lambda',\lambda'} = D_{w(\lambda+\lambda'),\lambda+\lambda'}$ *in* $\mathbf{U}_q^-$,
2. $[D_{w\lambda,\lambda}][x] = q^{(\lambda + w\lambda, \operatorname{wt} x)}[x][D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]$ *in* $\mathbf{A}_q[N_- \cap X_w]$.

Definition 2.27. By Proposition 2.26, we can consider the following localization:

$$\mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w] := \mathbf{A}_q[N_- \cap X_w][[\mathcal{D}_w]^{-1}].$$

This algebra $\mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w]$ is called *a quantum unipotent cell*. A quantum unipotent cell has a Q-graded algebra structure in an obvious way.

The following map $\eta_{w,q}$ is called *a quantum twist automorphism*. It is a quantum analogue of the (dual of) the twist automorphism $\eta_w^* \colon \mathbb{C}[N_-^w] \to \mathbb{C}[N_-^w]$, introduced by Berenstein, Fomin and Zelevinsky [2, 4] (see Section 1). See [14] for the precise argument of specialization at $q = 1$.

Proposition 2.28 ([14, Theorem 5.4])**.** *Let $w \in W$. Then there exists a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra automorphism $\eta_{w,q} \colon \mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w] \to \mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w]$ given by*

$$[D_{u,u_\lambda}] \mapsto q^{-(\lambda, \operatorname{wt} u - \lambda)} [D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1} [D_{u_{w\lambda},u}], \qquad [D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1} \mapsto q^{(\lambda, w\lambda - \lambda)} [D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]$$

for a weight vector $u \in V(\lambda)$ and $\lambda \in P_+$. In particular, $\operatorname{wt} \eta_{w,q}([x]) = -\operatorname{wt}[x]$ *for a homogeneous element $[x] \in \mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w]$.*

It is easy to show that the inverse of the quantum twist automorphism is given by

$$\eta_{w,q}^{-1}([D_{u_{w\lambda},u}]) = q^{(\lambda, \operatorname{wt} u - w\lambda)} [D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1} [D_{u,u_\lambda}] \tag{2.2}$$

for a weight vector $u \in V(\lambda)$ and $\lambda \in P_+$.

3. Quantum Chamber Ansatz

In this section, we prove quantum analogues of the Chamber Ansatz formulae for unipotent cells (Corollary 3.7) by using the quantum twist automorphisms. A quantum analogue of the homomorphism $y_{\boldsymbol{i}}^*$ (see (1.1)) is known as the Feigin homomorphism. By the Feigin homomorphisms, we can realize quantum unipotent cells in quantum tori. Quantum Chamber Ansatz formulae provide explicit description of the variables of quantum tori in terms of elements of quantum unipotent cells.

Definition 3.1. Let $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in I^\ell$. *The quantum affine space* (resp. *the quantum torus*) $\mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$) is the unital associative $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra generated by $t_1, \dots, t_\ell$ (resp. $t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_\ell^{\pm 1}$) subject to the relations;

$$t_j t_k = q^{(\alpha_{i_j}, \alpha_{i_k})} t_k t_j \text{ for } 1 \le j < k \le \ell,$$
$$t_k t_k^{-1} = t_k^{-1} t_k = 1 \text{ for } 1 \le k \le \ell.$$

Define the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-linear map $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \colon \mathbf{U}_q^- \to \mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ by

$$x \mapsto \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}=(a_1,\dots,a_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}^\ell} q_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{a}) (x, f_{i_1}^{(a_1)} \cdots f_{i_\ell}^{(a_\ell)})_L t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_\ell^{a_\ell}$$

where

$$q_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{a}) := \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} q_{i_k}^{a_k(a_k-1)/2}.$$

Note that the all but finitely many summands in the right-hand side are zero. The map $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ is called *a Feigin homomorphism*.

Proposition 3.2 ([1, Theorem 2.1, Theorem 3.1])**.** (1) *For $\boldsymbol{i} \in I^\ell$, the map $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra homomorphism.*

(2) *For $w \in W$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in I(w)$, we have* $\operatorname{Ker} \Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} = (\mathbf{U}_w^-)^\perp$.

(3) *For $w \in W$, $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$ and $\lambda \in P_+$, we have*

$$\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}(D_{w\lambda,\lambda}) = q_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{a}) t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_\ell^{a_\ell}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$ with $a_k := \langle w_{\le k} h_{i_k}, w\lambda \rangle$. Recall the notation in Definition 2.2.

Remark 3.3. For any $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in I^\ell$, we have $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}((1-q_i^2) f_i) = \sum_{k; i_k = i} t_k$.

Definition 3.4. Let $w \in W$ and $\boldsymbol{i} \in I(w)$. By Proposition 3.2 and the universality of localization, we have the embedding of the algebra $\mathbf{A}_q[N_-^w] \to \mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$, also denoted by $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}$.

The following is the main theorem in this paper. See also Corollary 3.7. Recall the notation in Definition 2.2.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $w \in W$, $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$ and $k = 1, \dots, \ell$. Then we have*

$$(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}]) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k} q_{i_j}^{d_j(d_j+1)/2} \right) t_1^{-d_1} t_2^{-d_2} \cdots t_k^{-d_k},$$

where $d_j := \langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k} \varpi_{i_k} \rangle, j = 1, \dots, k$.

Remark 3.6. Up to some conventions, Theorem 3.5 is a generalization of [3, Corollary 1.2], where they treat the case that w is the square of an acyclic Coxeter element. Moreover, by Theorem 3.5, we can say that the quantum twist automorphism $\eta_{w,q}$ is a generalization of Berenstein-Rupel's quantum twist automorphism [3, Theorem 2.10] and corresponds to the one proposed in [3, Conjecture 2.12 (c)]. The compatibility between quantum twist automorphisms and dual canonical bases which is proved in [14, Theorem 5.4] corresponds to Berenstein-Rupel's conjectural property [3, Conjecture 2.17 (a)]. Note that our approach does not refer quantum cluster algebra structures unlike Berenstein-Rupel's one.

Proof. If $w = e$, there is nothing to prove. From now on, we assume that $\ell(:= \ell(w))$ is greater than 0.

The proof is by induction on k. Let $k = 1$. Take $\lambda \in P_+$ such that $\langle h_{i_1}, w\lambda\rangle < 0$. Then it is easily seen that

$$D_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}} = [\langle h_{i_1}, w_{2\le}\lambda\rangle]_{i_1}^{-1} D_{u_{w\lambda},\, e_{i_1}.u_{w\lambda}}.$$

Hence, by (2.2),

$$(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}}]) = q_{i_1}^{\langle h_{i_1},\lambda\rangle}[\langle h_{i_1}, w_{2\le}\lambda\rangle]_{i_1}^{-1}\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}\left([D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1}[D_{e_{i_1}.u_{w\lambda},u_\lambda}]\right).$$

By Proposition 3.2 (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}\left([D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1}\right) &= q_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{c})^{-1}t_\ell^{-c_\ell}\cdots t_1^{-c_1},\\ \Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}\left([D_{e_{i_1}.u_{w\lambda},u_\lambda}]\right) &= q_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{c}-(1,0,\dots,0))[c_1]_{i_1}t_1^{c_1-1}t_2^{c_2}\cdots t_\ell^{c_\ell},\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1,\dots,c_\ell)$ with $c_j := \langle h_{i_j}, w_{j+1\le}\lambda\rangle$. Combining the above equalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}}]) &= q_{i_1}^{\langle h_{i_1},\lambda-w_{2\le}\lambda-\sum_{j=2}^{\ell}c_j\alpha_{i_j}\rangle+1}t_1^{-1}\\ &= q_{i_1}t_1^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the assertion in the case $k = 1$.

Assume that $k > 1$. By Proposition 2.22 and Remark 2.24, there exist $\lambda \in P_+$ and $b \in \mathscr{B}_w(\lambda)$ such that $D_{u_{w\lambda},G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)} = D_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k},\varpi_{i_k}}$.

Claim 1. $D_{u_{w\lambda},G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde f_{i_1}^{\max}b)} = D_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k},s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_k}}$. *Here* $\tilde f_{i_1}^{\max}b := \tilde f_{i_1}^{\varphi_{i_1}(b)}b = \tilde f_{i_1}^{\delta_{i_1,i_k}}b$.

Proof of Claim 1. Let $\delta := \delta_{i_1,i_k}$. Since $u_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_k}} = f_{i_1}^{\delta}.u_{\varpi_{i_k}}$, we have

$$D_{u_{w\lambda},f_{i_1}^{(p)}.G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)} = \begin{cases} D_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k},s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_k}} \ne 0 & \text{if } p = \delta,\\ 0 & \text{if } p > \delta.\end{cases}$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.18,

$$f_{i_1}^{(p)}.G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b) = \begin{cases} G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde f_{i_1}^{\max}b) & \text{if } p = \varphi_{i_1}(b),\\ 0 & \text{if } p > \varphi_{i_1}(b),\end{cases}$$

and, by Proposition 2.23, $\tilde f_{i_1}^{\max}b \in \mathscr{B}_w(\lambda)$. Hence,

$$D_{u_{w\lambda},f_{i_1}^{(p)}.G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)} = \begin{cases} D_{u_{w\lambda},G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde f_{i_1}^{\max}b)} \ne 0 & \text{if } p = \varphi_{i_1}(b),\\ 0 & \text{if } p > \varphi_{i_1}(b).\end{cases}$$

Combining the above arguments, we obtain $\varphi_{i_1}(b) = \delta$ and $D_{w\le_k\varpi_{i_k},s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_k}} = D_{u_{w\lambda},G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(\tilde{f}^{\max}_{i_1}b)}$. □

We write $b_2 := \tilde{e}^{\max}_{i_1} b = \tilde{e}^{\max}_{i_1}\tilde{f}^{\max}_{i_1} b$.

Claim 2. *We have*

$$D_{u_{w\lambda},G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b_2)} = q_{i_1}^{(X-1-2\langle h_{i_1},w\le_k\varpi_{i_k}\rangle)X/2} D^X_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}} D_{w\le_k\varpi_{i_k},\varpi_{i_k}},$$

where $X := -\langle h_{i_1}, w\lambda - w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle$.

Proof of Claim 2. By [18, Corollary 3.1.8], for $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ and $x \in \mathbf{U}^-_q$, we have

$$xe^{(p)}_{i_1} = \sum_{p'+p''+p'''=p} A(p',p'',p''')t_{i_1}^{-p'''} e^{(p'')}_{i_1} ({}_{i_1}e')^{p'} (e'_{i_1})^{p'''}(x) t^{p'}_{i_1},$$

where

$$A(p',p'',p''') := (-q_{i_1})^{p'''} q_{i_1}^{p'p''+p'p'''+p''p'''+p'^2} \frac{1}{(1-q_{i_1}^2)^{p'}[p']_{i_1}!} \frac{1}{(1-q_{i_1}^2)^{p'''}[p''']_{i_1}!}.$$

Therefore, for $x \in \mathbf{U}^-_q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(D_{u_{w\lambda},e^{(p)}_{i_1}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b)}, x)_L \\
&= (u_{w\lambda}, xe^{(p)}_{i_1}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b))^\varphi_\lambda \\
&= \sum_{p'+p''+p'''=p} A(p',p'',p''')(u_{w\lambda}, t_{i_1}^{-p'''} e^{(p'')}_{i_1} ({}_{i_1}e')^{p'} (e'_{i_1})^{p'''}(x) t^{p'}_{i_1}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b))^\varphi_\lambda \\
&= \sum_{p'+p''=p} A(p',0,p'')(u_{w\lambda}, t_{i_1}^{-p''} ({}_{i_1}e')^{p'} (e'_{i_1})^{p''}(x) t^{p'}_{i_1}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b))^\varphi_\lambda \\
&= \sum_{p'+p''=p} A(p',0,p'') q_{i_1}^{p'\langle h_{i_1},\mathrm{wt}\, b\rangle - p''\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda\rangle} (u_{w\lambda}, ({}_{i_1}e')^{p'} (e'_{i_1})^{p''}(x).G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b))^\varphi_\lambda \\
&= \sum_{p'+p''=p} A(p',0,p'') q_{i_1}^{p'\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda+\varpi_{i_k}-w\le_k\varpi_{i_k}\rangle - p''\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda\rangle} (D_{w\le_k\varpi_{i_k},\varpi_{i_k}}, ({}_{i_1}e')^{p'} (e'_{i_1})^{p''}(x))_L \\
&= \sum_{p'+p''=p} A(p',0,p'') q_{i_1}^{p'\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda+\varpi_{i_k}-w\le_k\varpi_{i_k}\rangle - p''\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda\rangle} (D^{p''}_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}} D_{w\le_k\varpi_{i_k},\varpi_{i_k}} D^{p'}_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}}, x)_L \\
&= \sum_{p'+p''=p} A(p',0,p'') q_{i_1}^{p'\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda-2w\le_k\varpi_{i_k}\rangle - p''\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda\rangle} (D^{p}_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}} D_{w\le_k\varpi_{i_k},\varpi_{i_k}}, x)_L.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the last equality follows from Proposition 2.26. Therefore we have

$$D_{u_{w\lambda},e^{(p)}_{i_1}.G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b)} = \sum_{p'+p''=p} A(p',0,p'') q_{i_1}^{p'\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda-2w\le_k\varpi_{i_k}\rangle - p''\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda\rangle} D^p_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}} D_{w\le_k\varpi_{i_k},\varpi_{i_k}}.$$

In particular, since $G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b_2) = e^{(\varepsilon_{i_1}(b))}_{i_1} G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b) = e^{(-\langle h_{i_1},w\lambda-w\le_k\varpi_{i_k}\rangle)}_{i_1} G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b)$ by Claim 1, we have

(3.1)

$$D_{u_{w\lambda},G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b_2)} = \frac{q_{i_1}^{-\langle h_{i_1},w\le_k\varpi_{i_k}\rangle X}}{(1-q_{i_1}^2)^X} \left(\sum_{p'+p''=X} (-q_{i_1})^{p''} q_{i_1}^{p''X} \frac{1}{[p']_{i_1}![p'']_{i_1}!} \right) D^X_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1},\varpi_{i_1}} D_{w\le_k\varpi_{i_k},\varpi_{i_k}}.$$

Recall that $X = -\langle h_{i_1}, w\lambda - w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle$. By the way, the following equality is well-known. See for instance [18, 1.3.1].

$$\sum_{t=0}^{a} q^{t(a-1)} \frac{[a]!}{[t]![a-t]!} z^t = \prod_{j=0}^{a-1} (1 + q^{2j} z)$$

for $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Substituting q by q_{i_1}, a by X and z by $-q_{i_1}^2$, we have

$$\sum_{t=0}^{X} (-q_{i_1})^t q_{i_1}^{tX} \frac{[X]_{i_1}!}{[t]_{i_1}![X-t]_{i_1}!} = \prod_{j=1}^{X} (1 - q_{i_1}^{2j}).$$

Combining this equality with (3.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_{u_{w\lambda}, G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2)} &= \frac{q_{i_1}^{-\langle h_{i_1}, w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle X} \prod_{j=1}^{X}(1 - q_{i_1}^{2j})}{(1-q_{i_1}^2)^X [X]_{i_1}!} D^X_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1}, \varpi_{i_1}} D_{w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}} \\ &= q_{i_1}^{(X-1-2\langle h_{i_1}, w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle)X/2} D^X_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1}, \varpi_{i_1}} D_{w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

By Claim 2 and $(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})(D_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1}, \varpi_{i_1}}) = q_{i_1} t_1^{-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{u_{w\lambda}, G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2)}]) \\ &= q_{i_1}^{(c_1 + \langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle - 1)X/2} (\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_1}, \varpi_{i_1}}])^X (\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}]) \\ &= q_{i_1}^{(c_1 + \langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle + 1)X/2} t_1^{-X} (\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}]). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Since our aim is to calculate $(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}])$, we describe $(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{u_{w\lambda}, G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2)}])$ in a different way. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta_{w,q}^{-1}([D_{u_{w\lambda}, G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2)}]) \\ &= q^{(\lambda, \mathrm{wt}\, b_2 - w\lambda)} [D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1} [D_{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2), u_\lambda}] = q^{(\lambda, \varpi_{i_k} - w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k} + X\alpha_{i_1})} [D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1} [D_{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2), u_\lambda}]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}([D_{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2), u_\lambda}]) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}=(a_1,\ldots,a_\ell)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\ell} q_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{a}) (G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2), f_{i_1}^{(a_1)} \cdots f_{i_\ell}^{(a_\ell)} . u_\lambda)_\lambda^\varphi t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_\ell^{a_\ell} \\ &= \sum_{(a_2,\ldots,a_\ell)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\ell-1}} q_{\boldsymbol{i}}((0, a_2, \ldots, a_\ell)) (G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2), f_{i_2}^{(a_2)} \cdots f_{i_\ell}^{(a_\ell)} . u_\lambda)_\lambda^\varphi t_2^{a_2} \cdots t_\ell^{a_\ell}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

The last equality holds because $e_{i_1} . G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2) = 0$ by Proposition 2.18. Here we prepare one more claim.

Claim 3. *Set $\mu_2 := w_{2\leq}\lambda$. Then $D_{u_{\mu_2}, G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2)} = D_{s_{i_1} w_{\leq k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}$.*

Proof of Claim 3. By Proposition 2.11, 2.12, 2.13 and Claim 1, for $x \in \mathbf{U}_q^-$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(D_{s_{i_1} w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k},\varpi_{i_k}}, x)_L \\
&= (u_{s_{i_1} w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}}, x.u_{\varpi_{i_k}})^{\varphi}_{\varpi_{i_k}} \\
&= \begin{cases} (u_{s_{i_1} w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}}, x.u_{\varpi_{i_k}})^{\varphi}_{\varpi_{i_k}} & \text{if } x \in \mathbf{U}_q^- \cap T_{i_1}(\mathbf{U}_q^-) = \operatorname{Ker} e'_{i_1}, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in f_{i_1}\mathbf{U}_q^- = (\operatorname{Ker} e'_{i_1})^{\perp}, \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} (u_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}}, T_{i_1}^{-1}(x).u_{s_{i_1}\varpi_{i_k}})^{\varphi}_{\varpi_{i_k}} & \text{if } x \in \mathbf{U}_q^- \cap T_{i_1}(\mathbf{U}_q^-), \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in f_{i_1}\mathbf{U}_q^- = (\operatorname{Ker} e'_{i_1})^{\perp}, \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} (u_{w\lambda}, T_{i_1}^{-1}(x).G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda}(\tilde{f}_{i_1}^{\max} b))^{\varphi}_{\lambda} & \text{if } x \in \mathbf{U}_q^- \cap T_{i_1}(\mathbf{U}_q^-), \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in f_{i_1}\mathbf{U}_q^- = (\operatorname{Ker} e'_{i_1})^{\perp}, \end{cases} \\
&= (u_{\mu_2}, x.G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda}(b_2))^{\varphi}_{\lambda} \\
&= (D_{u_{\mu_2}, G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda}(b_2)}, x)_L.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Set $\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le} := (i_2, \dots, i_\ell)$ and identify $\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}}$ with the subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$ generated by $t_2^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_\ell^{\pm 1}$. Write

$$C_2 := \prod_{j=2}^{k} q_{i_j}^{\langle s_{i_1} w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, s_{i_1} w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle(\langle s_{i_1} w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, s_{i_1} w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle+1)/2} = \prod_{j=2}^{k} q_{i_j}^{d_j(d_j+1)/2}.$$

By our induction assumption, Proposition 3.2 (3) and Claim 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_2 t_2^{-\langle w_{\le 2} h_{i_2}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle} \cdots t_k^{-\langle w_{\le k} h_{i_k}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle} \left(=: C_2 \overrightarrow{\prod_{j=2,\dots,k}} t_j^{-\langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle} \right) \\
&= (\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}} \circ \eta^{-1}_{w_{2\le},q})([D_{s_{i_1} w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}]) \\
&= (\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}} \circ \eta^{-1}_{w_{2\le},q})([D_{u_{\mu_2}, G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda}(b_2)}]) \\
&= \Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}}(q^{(\lambda, \varpi_{i_k} - w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k} + \langle h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle \alpha_{i_1})}[D_{w_{2\le}\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1}[D_{G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda}(b_2), u_\lambda}]) \\
&= q^{(\lambda, \varpi_{i_k} - w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k} + \langle h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle \alpha_{i_1})} q_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}}(\boldsymbol{c}')^{-1} t_\ell^{-c_\ell} \cdots t_2^{-c_2} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}'=(a_2,\dots,a_\ell)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}^{\ell-1}} q_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}}(\boldsymbol{a}')(G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda}(b_2), f_{i_2}^{(a_2)} \cdots f_{i_\ell}^{(a_\ell)}.u_\lambda)^{\varphi}_{\lambda} t_2^{a_2} \cdots t_\ell^{a_\ell},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{c}' = (c_2, \dots, c_\ell)$ with $c_j := \langle h_{i_j}, w_{j+1\le}\lambda\rangle$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}'=(a_2,\dots,a_\ell)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}^{\ell-1}} q_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}}(\boldsymbol{a}')(G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda}(b_2), f_{i_2}^{(a_2)} \cdots f_{i_\ell}^{(a_\ell)}.u_\lambda)^{\varphi}_{\lambda} t_2^{a_2} \cdots t_\ell^{a_\ell} \\
&= C_2 q^{-(\lambda, \varpi_{i_k} - w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k} + \langle h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle \alpha_{i_1})} q_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}}(\boldsymbol{c}') t_2^{c_2} \cdots t_\ell^{c_\ell} \overrightarrow{\prod_{j=2,\dots,k}} t_j^{-\langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Combining (3.3) and (3.4), we obtain the following equality ($\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, \cdots c_\ell), c_1 := \langle h_{i_1}, w_{2\le}\lambda\rangle$):

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.5)\qquad & (\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{u_{w\lambda}, G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2)}]) \\
&= q^{(\lambda, \varpi_{i_k} - w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k} + X\alpha_{i_1})} \Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}}([D_{w\lambda,\lambda}]^{-1}[D_{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b_2), u_\lambda}]) \\
&= C_2 q_{i_1}^{-\langle h_{i_1},\lambda\rangle\langle h_{i_1}, w\lambda\rangle} q_{\boldsymbol{i}}(\boldsymbol{c})^{-1} q_{\boldsymbol{i}_{2\le}}(\boldsymbol{c}') t_\ell^{-c_\ell} \dots t_1^{-c_1} t_2^{c_2} \cdots t_\ell^{c_\ell} \overrightarrow{\prod_{j=2,\dots,k}} t_j^{-\langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle} \\
&= C_2 q_{i_1}^{-\langle h_{i_1},\lambda\rangle\langle h_{i_1}, w\lambda\rangle - c_1(c_1-1)/2 - \sum_{j=2}^{\ell}\langle h_{i_1}, c_j\alpha_{i_j}\rangle} t_1^{-c_1} \overrightarrow{\prod_{j=2,\dots,k}} t_j^{-\langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle} \\
&= C_2 q_{i_1}^{c_1(c_1+1)/2} t_1^{-c_1} \overrightarrow{\prod_{j=2,\dots,k}} t_j^{-\langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Recall that $X = -\langle h_{i_1}, w\lambda - w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle = c_1 - \langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle$. By (3.5) and (3.2), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}}]) \\
&= C_2 q_{i_1}^{-(c_1 + \langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle + 1)(c_1 - \langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle)/2 + c_1(c_1+1)/2} t_1^{-\langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle} \overrightarrow{\prod_{j=2,\dots,k}} t_j^{-\langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle} \\
&= C_2 q_{i_1}^{\langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle(\langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle + 1)/2} t_1^{-\langle s_{i_1} h_{i_1}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle} \overrightarrow{\prod_{j=2,\dots,k}} t_j^{-\langle w_{\le j} h_{i_j}, w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}\rangle}.
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof. □

The following is a direct corollary of Theorem 3.5. These equalities are exact quantum analogues of the Chamber Ansatz formulae for unipotent cells [2, Theorem 1.4], [4, Theorem 1.4]. See also the proof of [4, Theorem 4.3].

Corollary 3.7. *Let $w \in W$ and $\boldsymbol{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell) \in I(w)$. For $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, set*

$$D'^{(\boldsymbol{i})}_{w_{\le j}\varpi_{i_j}, \varpi_{i_j}} := (\Phi_{\boldsymbol{i}} \circ \eta_{w,q}^{-1})([D_{w_{\le j}\varpi_{i_j}, \varpi_{i_j}}]).$$

By Theorem 3.5, these elements are Laurent monomials in $\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$. Then, for $k = 1, \dots, \ell$,

$$t_k \simeq (D'^{(\boldsymbol{i})}_{w_{\le k-1}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}})^{-1} (D'^{(\boldsymbol{i})}_{w_{\le k}\varpi_{i_k}, \varpi_{i_k}})^{-1} \prod_{j \in I\setminus\{i_k\}} (D'^{(\boldsymbol{i})}_{w_{\le k}\varpi_j, \varpi_j})^{-a_{j,i_k}},$$

here $\simeq$ means the coincidence up to some powers of q. Note that the right-hand side is determined up to powers of q.

Acknowledgment. The author is deeply grateful to Yoshiyuki Kimura for introducing the author to this subject. The author would like to express his sincere gratitude to his supervisor Yoshihisa Saito for his support and encouragement. The author wishes to thank Bernard Leclerc and Bea Schumann for enlightening comments.

References

[1] A. Berenstein: Group-like elements in quantum groups and Feigin's conjecture, arXiv preprint arXiv:q-alg/9605016 1996.

[2] A. Berenstein, S. Fomin, and A. Zelevinsky: Parametrizations of canonical bases and totally positive matrices. Adv. Math. **122**, no. 1, 49–149 (1996).

[3] A. Berenstein and D. Rupel: Quantum cluster characters of Hall algebras. Sel. Math. New Ser. **21**, no. 4, 1121–1176 (2015).

[4] A. Berenstein and A. Zelevinsky: Total positivity in Schubert varieties. Comment. Math. Helv. **72**, no. 1, 128–166 (1997).
[5] C. De Concini and C. Procesi: Quantum Schubert cells and representations at roots of 1, Algebraic groups and Lie groups, Austral. Math. Soc. Lect. Ser. **9**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 127–160 (1997).
[6] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky: Double Bruhat cells and total positivity, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **12**, no. 2, 335–380 (1999).
[7] C. Geiss, B. Leclerc, and J. Schröer: Generic bases for cluster algebras and the Chamber ansatz. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **25**, no. 1, 21–76 (2012).
[8] K. R. Goodearl and R. B. Warfield, Jr.: An introduction to noncommutative Noetherian rings, London Mathematical Society Student Texts **61**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition (2004).
[9] M. Kashiwara: On crystal bases of the Q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras, Duke Math. J. **63**, no. 2, 465–516 (1991).
[10] M. Kashiwara: The crystal base and Littelmann's refined Demazure character formula, Duke Math. J. **71**, no. 3, 839–858 (1993).
[11] M. Kashiwara: Crystal bases of modified quantized enveloping algebra, Duke Math. J, **73**, no. 2, 383–413 (1994).
[12] M. Kashiwara: Global crystal bases of quantum groups, Duke Math. J. **69**, no. 2, 455–485 (1993).
[13] Y. Kimura: Quantum unipotent subgroup and dual canonical basis. Kyoto J. Math. **52**, no. 2, 277–331 (2012).
[14] Y. Kimura and H. Oya: Twist automorphisms on Quantum unipotent cells and Dual canonical bases, arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.02268, 2017.
[15] G. Lusztig: Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3**, no. 2, 447–498 (1990).
[16] G. Lusztig: Quivers, perverse sheaves, and quantized enveloping algebras, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **4**, no. 2, 365–421 (1991).
[17] G. Lusztig: Total positivity in reductive groups. Lie theory and geometry, 531–568, Progr. Math. **123**, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, (1994).
[18] G. Lusztig: Introduction to quantum groups, Mod. Birkhäuser Class. New York, Reprint of the 1994 edition (2010).
[19] Y. Saito: PBW basis of quantized universal enveloping algebras. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **30**, no. 2, 209–232 (1994).

Hironori Oya: Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Tokyo, 153-8914, Japan
E-mail address: oya@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp